Case	:2576V-91963-MEF-MAH Document 31-1 Filed 03/12/25 Page 1 of 4 PageID: 181
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	x
3	SHEIKH SURAIVA,
4	Plaintiff,
5	v. 18 CV 6628 (JMF)
6	THOMAS CIOPPA and JEFFERSON
7	SESSIONS,
8	Defendants.
9	New York, N.Y.
10	July 31, 2018 2:30 p.m.
11	Before:
12	HON. JESSE M. FURMAN,
13	District Judge
14	APPEARANCES
15	DAVID RODKIN Attorney for Plaintiff
16	UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
17	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK Attorneys for Defendants
18	BY: BRANDON MATTHEW WATERMAN
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

challenges of this nature and that jurisdiction is proper only

25

in the district where the immigrant is detained.

I think applying that rule here, it's quite clear to me that this is properly brought in New Jersey and not properly brought here. I'm open to your arguments to the contrary. I read the summary of your arguments, and I just don't see how any of them gets you past that problem. It seems to me that that settles the matter.

Mr. Waterman proposes briefing a motion. Candidly, I think it's going to end up in the same place a month from now, and I'm trying to figure out why your client wouldn't just prefer to have the case transferred and proceed directly in New Jersey or dismissed and you can re-file it in New Jersey.

MR. RODKIN: The problem is she has to --

THE COURT: Can you use the microphone, please.

MR. RODKIN: The problem is she has to find new counsel in New Jersey, and that's very difficult for her.

THE COURT: I certainly understand that, and I'm sympathetic. I understand from your letter that you're not admitted in New Jersey and, therefore, couldn't represent her there.

I imagine you could help her find new counsel, and the fact that you're not admitted in New Jersey is not a basis for me to exercise jurisdiction in a case where the law says that I don't have jurisdiction.

I think in fact my order misspoke in referring to it